



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,870	07/05/2003	Peter Heiland	(H) 02ID0374USP	6273

7590

11/01/2005

M. Robert Kestenbaum  
11011 Bermuda Dunes NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87111

EXAMINER

TRINH, MINH N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3729

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/613,870

Applicant(s)

HEILAND, PETER

Examiner

Minh Trinh

Art Unit

3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119.**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claim 1-11) in the reply filed on 9/4/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has not established a prima facie case of serious burden of examination of the inventions of Groups I and II together. This is not found persuasive because the inventions of Group I and II each have a separate status in the art and clearly have a separate field of search, and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II (as indicated in the prior action, paragraph 1). Moreover, these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. In accordance with MPEP §803, the examiner has demonstrated that the inventions of Group I and II are each independent or distinct as claimed and a serious burden would be placed on the examiner as discussed above. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

2. Thus, method invention (Namely claims 12-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 9/4/05. A complete reply to this Office rejections must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Art Unit: 3729

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: " Electrostatic Gripping Device" or the like.

4. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the drawings are meet the requirements under 37 CFC 184(h, l, p, etc.); Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 3 is a duplication of claim 2 and should be cancelled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear as to whether the recitation of: "gripper elements" (claim 1, lines 5-6) is directed to "a gripper element" of line 3 or "gripper element" of line 5.

"the electrode pairs" (claim 1, line 6) lacks proper antecedent basis.

It is not clear as to how each of the recite limitations being connectively connected together as to form the gripper device. Also, it is unclear as to whether the recitation of: "at least two gripper elements " (claim 1, line 5) including "a gripper element " as previously recited in line 3.

"(Figs. 1, 2)" (claim 5, line 1) should be deleted.

"can be operated with a DC. . . " (see claim 7, lines 1-2) is not positive structure limitations, which has not further limiting the claimed device.

"when a component is being put down, etc" (claim 8, lines 1-2) is vague and indefinite in that it is un clear what being referred as component and whether the component is a part of the claimed device?

"which is such that the wafer can be lifted at it edges" (claim 9 , lines 1-2) is not further limit the claimed device.

8. Regarding claims 1-11. It is noted that no art rejections have been applied to claims 1-11, since there are a great deal of confusion an uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the limitations of the above claims. Therefore, it would not be proper to reject such claims on the basis of prior art. See MPEP 2173.06.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 3729

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited for their teaching of gripper device or the like.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mt  
10/28/05

  
**MINH TRINH**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**